UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,124	07/18/2003	Martin F. Bachmann	1700.0340001/BJD/SJE	3313
	7590 02/04/200 SLER, GOLDSTEIN &		EXAMINER	
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			BOESEN, AGNIESZKA	
WASHINGTO	.ON, DC 20003		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/622,124	BACHMANN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	AGNIESZKA BOESEN	1648				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Oc	ctober 2008					
<i>,</i> — · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.					
<i>;</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>63,68-76,78-88,94,97-116,118-123,126 and 128-139</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>74, 99, 105-107, 111-113, 121-123 and 133</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Togor Hold/Mail Bate: Notice of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 63,68-73,75,76,78-88,94,97,98,100-104,108-110,114-116,118-120,124,126,128-132 and 134-139.

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

The Amendment filed October 16, 2008 in response to the Office Action of April 16, 2008 is acknowledged and has been entered. Applicant's request for rejoinder of process claim 133 is acknowledged.

Claims 95, 117, 124, 125 and 127 have been canceled. Rejections of canceled claims are moot. New claims 134-139 have been added. Claims 63, 68-73, 75, 76, 78-88, 94, 97, 98, 100-104, 108-110, 114-116, 118-120, 124, 126, 128-132 and 134-139 are under examination in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Rejection of claims 63, 68-73, 75, 76, 78-88, 94, 97, 98, 100-104, 108-110, 114-116, 118-120, 124, 126, 128-132 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stockley et al. (US Patent 6,159,728) in view of Deghengi et al. (US 2002/0187938) and further in view of Kojima et al. (Nature, 1999 Vol. 402, p. 656-660) and Maita et al. (Gen Pept Accession VCBPQB, 1971) is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

New rejection in view of Applicant's amendment

The new rejection cites the same references that were cited in the withdrawn rejection and cites one additional reference.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/622,124

Art Unit: 1648

Claims 63, 68-73, 75, 76, 78-88, 94, 97, 98, 100-104, 108-110, 114-116, 118-120, 124, 126, 128-132 and 134-139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stockley et al. (US Patent 6,159,728) in view of Deghengi et al. (US 2002/0187938), Kojima et al. (Nature, 1999 Vol. 402, p. 656-660) Maita et al. (Gen Pept Accession VCBPQB, 1971) and further in view of Nielsen et al. (US Patent 6,548,651 B1).

Page 3

Stockey, Daghengi, Koijma and Maita teach the claimed invention as discussed on the record. Stockey teach the <u>covalent attachment</u> of an immunogenic peptide to the <u>cysteine residue</u> of the VLP RNA bacteriophage (see column 10, lines 29-67, column 11, lines 1-35 and column 12, lines 1-30). However Stockey does not teach the <u>non-peptide covalent attachment</u> of an immunogenic peptide to the cysteine residue of the VLP RNA bacteriophage. Stockey does not teach the second attachment site being a lysine residue of the VLP. Sockey does not teach a heterobifunctional cross-linker capable of reacting with first attachment site and a second attachment site, wherein the linker is succinimidyl 6-(β-maleimido-propionamido) hexanoate (SMPH) as required by new claims 134-139.

Nielsen et al. teach a non-peptide heterobifunctional cross-linker succinimidyl 6-(β-maleimido-propionamido) hexanoate (SMPH) covalently linking peptides with nucleic acid molecules representing bacterial antigens through either a cysteine (C) or a lysine (K) residue (see claim 1, Tables 1 and 4, column 8, lines 17-41 and column 9, lines 4-10).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to covalently attach Stockley's RNA Qβ bacteriophage to Deghenghi's and/or Kojima's ghrelin peptide using Nielsen's non-peptide heterobifunctional cross-linker succinimidyl 6-(β-maleimido-propionamido) hexanoate (SMPH) capable of reacting with the first attachment site

Art Unit: 1648

which is a lysine residue and a second attachment site which is a cysteine residue because Nielsen teaches that the SMPH is a suitable linker for attachment of peptides with nucleic acids (see claim 1, Tables 1 and 4, column 8, lines 17-41 and column 9, lines 4-10).

One would have been motivated to use Nielsen's succinimidyl 6-(β-maleimido-propionamido) hexanoate (SMPH) linker to attach Deghenghi's and/or Kojima's ghrelin peptide to Stockley's RNA Qβ bacteriophage because Nielsen teaches that the SMPH linker is used to attach peptides and nucleic acid molecules together.

One would have had a reasonable expectation of success to attach Deghenghi's and/or Kojima's ghrelin peptide to Stockley's RNA Q β bacteriophage using Nielsen's SMPH linker because the linker technology has been well established in the art at the time of the present invention as evidenced by Nielsen et al.

Therefore the present claims would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time of the present invention.

Response to Applicant's arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. Applicants argue that neither Stockey, Dehenghi, Koijma or Maita teach non-peptide covalent coupling between the RNA bacteriophage and an antigen of interest or the first attachment site being a lysine residue and the second attachment site being the cysteine residue. The new reference by Nielsen et al. (US Patent 6,548,651 B1) cures the deficiencies of Stockey, Dehenghi, Koijma or Maita as discussed above.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1648

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground of rejections presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AGNIESZKA BOESEN whose telephone number is (571)272-8035. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1648

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Agnieszka Boesen/

Examiner, Art Unit 1648

/Bruce Campell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1648